

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

**Question 85, Reference Draft RFP Section H, Paragraph # H.5.2.4**

Title: Systemic Defect Warranty

**Statement:**

The contractor is held responsible for correcting systemic defects, at no cost to the Government. There are currently several areas that could potentially be classified as systemic defects of the baseline TDP that have shown up in the Phase I test and A1 field service reports. They are pre-existing problems and require some level of redesign to correct.

**Question 85:**

Is the contractor liable for warranting pre-existing problems under this category? Does the Government have a list of Systemic Defects that have been identified to date, and could it be made available?

**Answer 85:** The contractor is not liable for the warranty of pre-existing problems. There have been no "Systemic Defects" identified by the Government to date, so there is no list available.

**Question 117, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.1.7.2.B & C.2.1.1.1**

Title: Program Support

**Statement:**

C.1.7.2B Program Support....."ECP/RFW/RFD/VECP Requirements – (Contractor Generated)- No cost if implementation does not exceed \$10,000"

C.2.1.1.1 Program Support...General..."Only no-cost/cost reduction type changes generated under program support"

These two paragraphs seem to contradict each other.

**Question 117:**

What does the "not to exceed \$10,000" sentence mean?

**Answer 117:** Provision H.16.1 establishes that Contractor generated changes which reflect a total +/- \$10,000 shall be incorporated at no cost to either party. Therefore,

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

changes which do not exceed \$10,000 are considered to be "no-cost" changes. A clarification will be made in the Final RFP.

**Question 142, Reference ATTACHMENT 2 – DRAWING 12378639**

Title: Cab Stowage Box Installation

**Statement:**

The ECP SSS-5784 added an upper cab storage box behind the driver's head. The same upper storage box is part of the Digitization Rack/Storage Kit (ref 57K2012). The mounting hardware for the stowage box for the production installation is depicted on 12378639 Sheet 2, Zone F3-G3. If you compare it against the same installation on the Digitization Kit drawing 57K2012, Sheet 8, View G you will see that a washer P/N 12414473-011 (Item 13) can be added as required at each of the mounting points. This washer is used as a shim between the cab shell and the stowage box bracket. This washer is not shown on the cab stowage box installation. Based on a review of the interface points on the baseline cab shell drawing (ref 12414750) there may be times that this washer is required. This is shown in Detail T of Sheet 2 on drawing 57K2012 Zone C4.

**Question 142A:**

Will the cab stowage box installation drawing (ref 12378639) be revised to permit the installation on the extra washers as required?

**Answer 142A:** *No, the installation drawing will not be revised. The information presented on that drawing is correct for the on-the-line production of vehicles with the stowage box.*

**Question 142B:**

If not, will the Digitization Rack/Stowage Kit drawing (ref 57K2012) be revised to eliminate item #13 or the washers P/N 12414473-011?

**Answer 142B:** *No, the kit drawing will not be revised. The information presented on that drawing is correct for the installation of the stowage box in fielded vehicles. The washers are necessary in this usage due to the presence of the RL-200 coating. Due to the compressibility of the RL-200, it is necessary to build up a solid support to replace the thickness of the RL-200 coating removed in the drilling of the mounting holes. A*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

*stackup of the washers is the best way to accomplish this, as the thickness of the RL-200 coating varies slightly from vehicle to vehicle. )*

**Question 275, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # N/A**

Title: Attachment 2/12412708

**Statement:**

A manifold P/N 12412708 is installed on the bottom of the FMTV M1089 hydraulic tank assembly P/N 12412294. This part is used to supply oil to the three inlet ports of the tridem hydraulic pump on the wrecker (on suction side of the pump). A closer inspection of the requirements for the manifold requires it to withstand an operating pressure of 3,000-PSI (Note 8). The main body of the manifold (12412708-01) is required to be produced from "Steel, Tube, DOM Welded, 2.000 OD X .065 Wall IAW SAE J525." A review of the tubing material properties/industry practice indicates that the tube is capable of a pressure of 3,150-PSI without bursting. Other similar hydraulic components used on the pressure side of the hydraulic system, with an operating pressure of 3,000-PSI must have a burst pressure of 12,000-PSI. This results in a minimum safety factor of 4:1. Since this is not possible given the theoretical/actual properties of the material and the pressure that the component (12412708) would be subjected to, the 3,000-PSI operating pressure appears to be an error.

**Question 275A:**

Should the drawing state that the minimum burst pressure for the manifold is 3,000-PSI or a lower value based on the suction side application?

**Answer 275A:** *The drawing will be revised to reflect lower values for the suction side applications. Preliminary analysis provides a recommended maximum allowable pressure of 1,300 PSI, with a working pressure of 325 PSI.*

**Question 275B:**

If the operating pressure requirement is stated properly, are competitors expected to modify the design of the manifold to withstand a burst pressure of 12,000-PSI via a new ECP?

**Answer 275B:** *See response to 275A above.*

**Question 275C:**

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

Has the current component manufacturer ever supplied a certification on this component, and if yes, will it be provided to both competitors?

**Answer 275C:** *No, the drawing does not specify any pressurization testing.*

**Question 275D:**

If the part has been functioning properly as designed, will the Government clarify what the certification requirements are for this component?

**Answer 275D:** *Note 8 will be revised to ask for a pressure test based upon expected vacuum pull of the hydraulic pump or eliminated based upon the fact there has been no known failures.*

**Question 277, Reference ATPD**

**Statement:**

The A1 PVT report does not include the test results for the Expansible Van testing.

**Question 277:**

Are test results available for any testing done on the Expansible Van? If so, can the Government provide a copy of the final report for the Expansible Van?

**Answer 277:** *The A1 PVT Test Report for the Expansible Van is available. It has been converted to CD and will be sent under separate cover.*

**Question 299, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.4.1**

Title: Safety

**Statement:**

Paragraph C.2.4.1 states that "The Contractor shall comply with all federal vehicle safety, noise and emissions requirements and standards, hereinafter referred to as requirements, affecting the supplies to be delivered IAW ATPD 2131C, Attachment 1 and in effect at the time of contract award".

Government response to Phase 1 RFP question "EN-A04" stated the following: "Per Title 49 CFR 571.7 (c), Military Vehicles are exempt from Federal Motor Vehicle Safety

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

Standards (FMVSS), and therefore, no waiver of FMVSS standards is necessary. FMVSS standards are incorporated on a selective basis in the FMTV vehicle specification. To the best of our knowledge, neither FMVSS or EPA data plate requirements are applicable to the FMTV vehicle system, and contractors will not be required to install such data plates in either Phase I or Phase II of the Competitive Rebuy acquisition.”

The word “all” in the phrase “comply with all federal vehicle safety ...” within the C.2.4.1 paragraph creates some potential confusion and/or conflict with the previous Government directive found in question EN -A04.

**Question 299A:**

Can the Government confirm that the FMTV does not currently, nor is it required to, meet all FMVSS and EPA standards?

**Answer 299A:** *The FMTV does not currently meet all FMVSS standards, and is not required to.*

**Question 299B:**

Can the Government confirm that only those FMVSS and EPA standard requirements that are specifically addressed in Section 3 of the ATPD and the associated variant specific ATPD Annexes apply to the FMTV Competitive Rebuy program?

**Answer 299B:** *Vehicles produced under the FMTV CR Program must meet all FMVSS standards expressly referenced in ATPD 2131C and Annexes thereof.*

**Question 299C:**

Can the Government confirm that the answer to the Phase I question EN-A04 is still true and relates to the Phase II production contract?

**Answer 299C:** *Yes, it is still true.*

**Question 299D:**

Will the Government consider clarifying paragraph C.2.4.1 by replacing the word “all” in the first sentence with the phrase “all ATPD applicable” federal vehicle safety, noise and emissions requirements and standards?

**Answer 299D:** *Yes, the Government will consider such a change to that paragraph.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

**Question 311, Reference Draft RFP Section M**

Title: Changes

**Statement:**

New variants were provided within the May 2002 TDP for the LHS truck, LHS Trailer, and HIMARS Re-supply Vehicle.

**Question 311:**

Can the Contractors propose integrating changes to these variants that are common to the changes proposed and tested within Phase I?

**Answer 311:** *Yes, to the maximum extent possible, the Offerors are to propose integrating CR common ECPs into the new variants.*

=====

**PROPOSED REVISION:**

**Question 249, Reference: ATPD, Page 93, Paragraph # E.2.6**

Title: Main Recovery Winch System

**Statement:** The Final Report for Production Verification Test (PVT) of the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles (FTMV) dated June 2000 was provided as Attachment 21 of the Phase I FMTV A1CR contract. There were some deficiencies noted for the main winch system for the M1089A1 (Ref. Paragraph 2.21.5). A question on this issue was submitted during Phase I (Ref Question Set 11, PAT-41) where the answer provided stated that a retest was conducted at the manufacturer's facility and the issue was closed.

**Question 249A:** What change or changes were made to the M1089A1 to address this issue and allow it to comply with the requirements?

**Revised Answer 249A:** *No changes were made. The retest indicated the winch did not meet the high-speed load requirements, however, the user accepted this based on its low*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP  
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS  
SET H**

**03 Jul 02**

*operational impact. The winch requirements of ATPD 2131C para E.2.6 as written in the draft RFP reflect the acceptable performance range (“minimum bottom layer rating single line pull capability of 30,000 lb. (13,600 kg) +/-10%, per SAE J706 and no less than 50% of that capability at top layer line pull.”).*

**Question 249B:** Are all these changes reflected in the Technical Data Package (TDP) supplied with this draft RFP?

**Answer 249B:** *No changes were made.*

**Question 249C:** If the problems were the result of manufacturing problems/processes at the winch manufacturer, are there any periodic tests or in process inspections required to be performed at either the winch, wrecker system, or vehicle manufacturer that the competitors need to be aware of or follow during future vehicle production?

**Answer 249C:** *No specific manufacturing/process problems were noted. Your inspections/tests should be based upon contract requirements and those determined IAW your quality system and control plans.*